

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, various claims are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 4-13 and 16-20 are pending and under consideration.

II. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The claims are amended to overcome the rejection.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 4 and 16 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 13 from which claims 4 and 16 depend, respectively. Applicants disagree with the assertion made in the outstanding Office Action that the cursory reading display mode recited in claims 1 and 13, respectively, is a more detailed version of the "at least one of said plurality of automatic paging display modes, said display mode makes said displaying section display partially each page by extracting a document element corresponding to a predetermined condition from document elements constituting each page and displaying said extracted document element on said displaying section", which is a feature recited in claims 4 and 16. According to claim 1 and 13, respectively, the cursory reading display mode is one of the plurality of automatic display modes, "in which title and emphasized parts, of the document contents in each page, are extracted to display so that an outline of the contents of each page is viewable to the user." The "at least one of said plurality of automatic paging display modes, said display mode makes said displaying section display partially each page by extracting a document element corresponding to a predetermined condition from document elements constituting each page and displaying said extracted document element on said displaying section" of claim 4 and the corresponding features recited in claim 16 are not recited in claims 1 and 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim objections.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4-13, and 16-20 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,801,713 to Endo et al. (hereinafter "Endo") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,798 to Palmer et al. ("Palmer").

Claim 1 is directed to a display apparatus having a displaying section, a displaying control section, means for providing a reading display mode, means for providing a plurality of

automatic paging display modes, and selecting means. According to claim 1, the apparatus is able to display a document content in the following display modes: “**an outline view display mode** in which only document structure is displayed as a layout so that the whole of each page is viewable to the user”; “**a cursory reading display mode** in which title and emphasized parts, of the document contents in each page, are extracted to display so that an outline of the contents of each page is viewable to the user”; and “**a reading display mode** of displaying the whole contents of each page of said document contents on said displaying section” (emphasis added) .

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that “Endo discloses a method in which **the document may be scrolled** in at least two modes; A1 (cursory mode) which would allow for a user to read the page and view the outlines and A2 (general view mode) which is faster and would simply allow the user to get a good look at the page as a whole” (emphasis added, see the Office Action mailed on June 6, 2006, page 4 lines 15-19). The above statement already marks the difference between Endo and the claims, since Endo is directed to the manner of scrolling the document (i.e., the page-turning speed), which implies a dynamic change of the displayed image, while the claims of the present application refer to displaying modes related to manner of displaying the content of a document. It is not clear based on the above cited statement which two of the three modes defined in claim 1 are allegedly made obvious by Endo, but based on the fact that the Examiner relies on Palmer to disclose the mode in which only the title and emphasized parts are shown (the cursory reading mode), Applicants assume that the Examiner considered that Endo disclosed the outline view display mode and the reading display mode.

The Examiner indicated in the Office Action as support for the above-cited statement FIG. 3, FIG. 4 and the portion of column 5 between lines 15 and 25 of Endo. FIG. 3 of Endo is a diagram illustrating correspondence between automatic page-turning options A1-A4 and two dynamic picture display parameters: a frame display time (w) and a frame display pitch (m). FIG. 4 is a diagram of the correspondence between automatic page-turning options B1-B2 and another dynamic picture display parameter, a display priority (r). In the indicated portion of Endo, the following modes are described:

- A1 is a normal display in which all data in the page is displayed for the page-turning interval T ;
- A2 is a fast (e.g., high-speed) display in which the display time for each frame of animation data in dynamic pictures is reduced;
- A3 is a display with skipped frames in which at least one frame of animation data in dynamic pictures is skipped; and

- A4 is a display without any animation data in dynamic pictures.

The options B1 and B2 represent a "strict" page-turning interval (in which the page display may be interrupted after the page-turning interval T has elapsed) and a "lazy" page-turning interval (in which the page display cannot be interrupted even after the page-turning interval T has elapsed) respectively.

Based on the indicated portions of Endo or Endo's disclosure as a whole, Applicants respectfully consider that at least the outline view display mode and the reading display mode are not taught or suggested by the display modes A1 and A2 or any other display modes described therein. In contrast to Endo, which is related to the page-turning speed, Applicant's claimed invention as specifically recited, for example, in claim 1, specifies how the modes correspond to the reading characteristics.

It is respectfully submitted that Endo and Palmer, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest at least the three display modes corresponding to the reading characteristics specifically recited in, for example, claim 1 and 13. Consequently, at least one of the three "basic criteria [that] **must** be met" in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations" (emphasis added, see MPEP 2142) is not satisfied. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses, and requests reconsideration of, this rejection based on Endo and Palmer.

Dependent claims 4-12 and 16-20 are patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claims 1 and 13.

V. CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept. 06, 2006

By: L. Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501